

<b>FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL FORM</b>	Application Number	10/658,654
	Filing Date	September 9, 2003
	First Named Inventor	Hamerski, Michael D.
	Art Unit	3632
	Examiner Name	Anita M. King
	Attorney Docket Number	56127US008
	Attorney for Applicant	William L. Huebsch
Fax No.: 571-273-8300		
Total Number of Pages in This Submission: 24		
Date: August 4, 2005		

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Issue Fee Transmittal <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment Transmittal	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/Declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert a Provisional Application	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Technology Center (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief, Amended Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosures: <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR § 1.52 or 1.53 <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 35 USC 371 in US Designated/Elected Office (DO/EOLUS)	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund  <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Continued Examination (RCE) Transmittal	
<input type="checkbox"/> Drawings	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Technology Center	
<b>REMARKS:</b>		

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION  
MAY CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL OR LEGALLY PRIVILEGED INFORMATION  
INTENDED ONLY FOR THE PERSON OR ENTITY NAMED BELOW.

If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, use, disclose, distribute or copy this transmission.  
If this transmission was received in error, please immediately notify me by telephone directly at (651) 733-2835 or  
(651) 733-1500, and we will arrange for its return at no cost to you.

**32692**

Customer Number

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****AUG 04 2005**Patent  
Case No.: 56127US008**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**First Named Inventor: **HAMERSKI, MICHAEL D.**Application No.: **10/658,654**Group Art Unit: **3632**Filed: **September 9, 2003**Examiner: **Anita M. King**Title: **HANGER****FILING OF AMENDED BRIEF ON APPEAL**Mail Stop Appeal Briefs-Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR § 1.8(a)]**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
- ☒ transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (571) 273-8300.

Aug 4, 2005  
DateSusan P. Gumatz  
Signed by: Susan P. Gumatz

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Communication from the Examiner dated July 6, 2005, indicating that the Brief on Appeal filed on April 22, 2005 was defective.

Following is an amended Brief on Appeal which is believed to comply with 37 CFR 41.37.

Respectfully submitted,

August 4, 2005  
DateBy: W. L. Huebsch  
William L. Huebsch, Reg. No.: 25,990  
Telephone No.: (651) 733-2835Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833

**32692**  
Customer Number

**RECEIVED**  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
**AUG 04 2005**

Patent  
Case No.: 56127US008

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

First Named Inventor: **HAMERSKI, MICHAEL D.**  
Application No.: **10/658,654** Group Art Unit: **3632**  
Filed: **September 9, 2003** Examiner: **Anita M. King**  
Title: **HANGER**

**BRIEF ON APPEAL**

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

<b>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR § 1.8(a)]</b>	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (571) 273-8300.
Date: <u>Aug 4, 2005</u>	Signed by: <u>Susan P. Gumatz</u> Signed by: Susan P. Gumatz

Dear Sir:

This is an appeal from the Office Action mailed on November 30, 2004, finally rejecting claims 1-20.

A Notice of Appeal in this application was sent via facsimile on February 23, 2005, and was received in the USPTO on February 23, 2005.

The fee required under 37 CFR § 41.20(b)(2) for filing an appeal brief was already charged to Deposit Account No. 13-3723.

It is believed that no fee is due; however, in the event a fee is required, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 13-3723.

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

**REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is 3M Company (formerly known as Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company) of St. Paul, Minnesota and its affiliate 3M Innovative Properties Company of St. Paul, Minnesota.

**RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals or interferences.

**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-20 are pending and stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a).

**STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

No amendments have been filed after the final rejection.

**SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

The claims at issue concern a paper hanger for supporting one or more sheets of paper. As claimed in claim 1 and with reference to a first embodiment in Figures 1-3 of the drawing, the paper hanger 10 comprises a base 12 having a supported surface 13 adapted to be positioned along a generally vertical surface, and an opposite outer surface 15; and an elongate peg 16 having a longitudinal axis 17 and first and second longitudinally spaced ends 18 and 19, a portion of the peg 16 adjacent its first end 18 being mounted on the base 12 in a use position with the axis 17 of the peg 16 being generally at a right angle with respect to the supported surface 13, and a major portion of the peg 16 adjacent its second 19 end projecting from the outer surface 15 of the base 12. That major portion of the peg 16 has a diameter of less than about 0.17 inch ( 0.43 centimeter), has a generally uniform cross sectional area along its length, and has an axially extending surface portion 20 adapted to be positioned uppermost when the supported surface 13 is positioned along a generally vertical surface, only the axially extending surface portion 20 of the peg 16 being adapted to restrict free movement of sheets of paper around the peg 16 axially of the peg 16 (see spec, page 2, lns 9-18; Figures 1-3; page 4, ln 18 to page 5, ln 2).

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 561271US008

The axially extending surface portion 20 of the peg 16 can define closely spaced sharp edges that are adapted to restrict free movement of sheets of paper around the peg 16 axially of said peg 16 (claim 2; spec., page 2, lns 18-20; page 4, lns 28-29). Those sharp edges can be defined by machine screw threads extending around the axis 17 of the peg 16 (claim 3; spec., page 2, lns 20-21; page 4, ln 30; page 5, lns 3-4); the peg 36 can be serrated to form peaks having those sharp edges (claim 4; spec., page 2, ln 22; Figure 6; page 6, ln 26; page 7, lns 1-3); the peg 45 can include a coating of abrasive granules 48 that have those sharp edges (claim 5; spec., page 2, lns 22-23; Figure 7; spec. page 7, lns 18-30); or the peg can have axially spaced transverse ridges only on its axially extending surface portion that have those sharp edges (claim 6; spec., page 2, lns 20-21).

The peg 51 can include a coating 56 of adhesive defining its axially extending surface portion 54 that is adapted to restrict free movement of sheets of paper around the peg 51 axially of the peg 51 (claim 7; spec., page 2, lns 18-19; Figure 8; page 7, ln 31 to page 8, ln 14).

The second end 19 of the peg 16 can be pointed to facilitate pressing sheets over the peg 16 (claim 8; spec., page 3, lns 3-10; Figure 1; spec., page 5, lns 19-28).

The major portion of the peg 16 adjacent its second end 19 can project from the outer surface 15 of the base 12 by a distance in a range of about 0.15 to 0.30 inch or 0.38 to 0.76 centimeter, and the peg 16 can have a diameter of about 0.11 inch or 0.28 centimeter (claims 9 and 10; spec., page 2, lns 24-31; page 5, lns 5-11).

The paper hanger 10 can include a length 14 of stretch release adhesive adhered to the supported surface 13 of the base 12 and adapted for adhering the base 12 to a generally vertical surface (claim 11; spec., page 3, lns 17-22; page 5, ln 29 to page 6, ln 10).

Also, the portion of the peg 66 adjacent its first end 68 can be mounted on the base 62 for movement of the peg 62 between its use position (Figures 9 and 10) and a storage position (Figure 11) with the peg extending along the outer surface 65 of the base 62 (claim 12; spec., page 3, lns 11-16; Figures 9-11; page 8, ln 18 to page 9, ln 4).

The claims 13-20 at issue concern the combination of at least one sheet of paper and a paper hanger. As claimed in independent claim 13 and with reference to a first embodiment in Figures 1-3 of the drawing, the sheet of paper 22 has a through opening 23. The paper hanger 10

Application No.: 10/658,654Case No.: 56127US008

comprises a base 12 having a supported surface 13 adapted to be positioned along a generally vertical surface, and an opposite outer surface 15; and an elongate peg 16 having a longitudinal axis 17 and first and second longitudinally spaced ends 18 and 19, a portion of the peg 16 adjacent its first end 18 being mounted on the base 12 in a use position with the axis 17 of the peg 16 being generally at a right angle with respect to the supported surface 13, and a major portion of the peg 16 adjacent its second 19 end projecting from the outer surface 15 of the base 12. That major portion of the peg 16 has a diameter of less than about 0.17 inch ( 0.43 centimeter), has a generally uniform cross sectional area along its length, and has an axially extending surface portion 20 defining closely spaced sharp edges, the portion of the peg adjacent its second end 19 extending through the opening 23 in the sheet of paper 22, and the surface portion 20 defining the sharp edges being adapted to be positioned uppermost when the supported surface 13 is positioned along a generally vertical surface so that only the sharp edges restrict movement of the sheet of paper 22 around the peg 16 axially of the peg 16 (see spec, page 2, lns 9-20; Figures 1-3; page 4, ln 18 to page 5, ln 2).

The sharp edges can be defined by machine screw threads extending around the axis 17 of the peg 16 (claim 14; spec., page 2, lns 20-21; page 4, ln 30; page 5, lns 3-4).

The peg 36 can be serrated to form peaks having those sharp edges (claim 15; spec., page 2, ln 22; Figure 6; page 6, ln 26; page 7, lns 1-3).

The peg 45 can include a coating of abrasive granules 48 that have those sharp edges (claim 16; spec., page 2, lns 22-23; Figure 7; spec. page 7, lns 18-30).

The second end 19 of the peg 16 can be pointed to facilitate pressing sheets over the peg 16 (claim 17; spec., page 3, lns 3-10; Figure 1; spec., page 5, lns 19-28).

The peg can have axially spaced transverse ridges only on its axially extending surface portion that have those sharp edges (claim 18; spec., page 2, lns 20-21).

The major portion of the peg 16 adjacent its second end 19 can project from the outer surface 15 of the base 12 by a distance in a range of about 0.15 to 0.30 inch or 0.38 to 0.76 centimeter; and the peg 16 can have a diameter of about 0.11 inch or 0.28 centimeter (claims 19 and 20; spec., page 2, lns 24-31; page 5, lns 5-11).

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

**GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

**Independent claim 1** and claims 2, 4, 6, 9, and 10 dependent on claim 1 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Japanese Patent 10-95495 to Sekikawa; **independent claim 1** and claims 2-4, 6 and 8-10 dependent on claim 1 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Swiss Patent 247,664 to Schlaeppli in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,129,297 to Bussi; and **independent claim 1**, and claims 2-4, 6, 8-10 and 12 dependent on claim 1 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,040,149 to Einhorn in view of Bussi. Claim 5 dependent on claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Sekikawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,866,583 to Batts and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,690,561 to Rowland et al. Claim 7 dependent on claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Sekikawa in view of Batts. Claim 11 dependent on claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Sekikawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,106,937 to Hamerski, and also as purportedly unpatentable over Schlaeppli in view of Bussi and further in view of Hamerski.

**Independent claim 13** and claims 15 and 17 to 20 dependent on claim 1 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,430,301 to Venus in view of Sekikawa. Claim 14 dependent on claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Venus in view of Sekikawa in view of Schlaeppli and further in view of Bussi. Claim 16 dependent on claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Venus in view of Sekikawa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,690,561 to Rowland et al.

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

**ARGUMENT**

**Rejection of Independent claim 1 and claims 2, 4, 6, 9, and 10 dependent on claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Japanese Patent 10-95495 to Sekikawa:**

Sekikawa describes a hanger that, like the hanger according to the present invention as claimed in claim 1, includes a base having a supported surface adapted to be positioned along a generally vertical surface, and an opposite outer surface; an elongate peg having a longitudinal axis and first and second longitudinally spaced ends, a portion of which peg adjacent its first end is mounted on the base in a use position with the axis of said peg projecting away from said supported surface, at least a major portion of which peg adjacent its second end projects from the outer surface of the base. Also, the peg described in Sekikawa has axially extending surface portions adapted to be positioned uppermost when the supported surface is positioned along a generally vertical surface. Additionally, like the embodiment of the hanger according to the present invention claimed in claim 2, the peg described in Sekikawa defines sharp edges along its surface portion.

Unlike the hanger according to the present invention, however, the hanger described by Sekikawa is of a well known type used for supporting a number of clothes hangers engaged with garments such as the garment or coat illustrated in Figure 7 thereof and would necessarily be a large strong structure in order to be able to support such clothes hangers and garments. Normal sized sheets of paper pressed over the end of the hanger described by Sekikawa would be significantly destroyed by the opening that would be formed in them by the end of the hanger.

In contrast, the paper hanger according to the present invention as claimed in claim 1 is for supporting one or more sheets of paper, and the major portion of the peg on which the paper sheets are supported has a diameter of less than about 0.17 inch (0.43 centimeter) which is significantly smaller than the diameter of clothes hangers of the type described by Sekikawa so that the paper hanger according to the present invention is suitable for supporting sheets of paper in that it only requires or forms a small opening through them, but would not have sufficient size or strength to support a number of clothes hangers engaged with garments. It would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art of hangers to miniaturize a clothes hanger of the type described by Sekikawa for the purpose of making a paper hanger.



Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

There is no teaching or suggestion in Sekikawa to use their peg to support sheets of paper, nor to provide a peg for supporting the sheets of paper that projects generally at a right angle with respect to the supported surface on its base and has a major portion with a diameter of less than about 0.17 inch (0.43 centimeter) and a generally uniform cross sectional area along its length. There is no teaching or suggestion in Sekikawa that these features were recognized as result effective variables. For this reason, no basis exists for the Examiner's conclusion that it would have been obvious to adapt these features based on "optimization of proportions in a prior art device" as a "design consideration". See in re Antonie, 559 F.2<sup>nd</sup> 618, 620, 195 USPQ 6, 8-9 (CCPA 1977). The Examiner's obviousness conclusion lacks the requisite suggestion for the proposed modifications as well as the requisite reasonable expectation that the proposed modifications would be successful. See In re O'Farrell, 853 F.2<sup>nd</sup> 846, 850-51, 7 USPQ2<sup>nd</sup> 1673, 1680-81 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Thus, the structure for a paper hanger recited in claim 1 is not made obvious by Sekikawa.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 9, and 10 are dependent on claim 1, and thus are allowable for all of the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Additionally, these dependent claims include further structural limitations that are not shown or suggested in the claimed combination by Sekikawa. For example, claim 4 recites that the peg is serrated (see Fig. 6) to form peaks having sharp edges on its axially extending surface portion that restrict free movement of sheets of paper around peg axially of the peg. Sekikawa does not describe or suggest such a serrated surface. Claim 9 recites that a major portion of the peg adjacent its second end projects from said the outer surface of its base by a distance in a range of about 0.15 to 0.30 inch (0.38 to 0.76 centimeter); whereas claim 10 recites that feature together with the feature that the peg has a diameter of about 0.11 inch (0.28 centimeter). Such dimensions are not suggested by the clothes hanger of Sekekawa.

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

**Rejection of independent claim 1 and claims 2-4, 6 and 8-10 dependent on claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Swiss Patent 247,664 to Schlaeppli in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,129,297 to Bussi**

Schlaeppli describes a hangers that, like the hanger according to the present invention as claimed in claim 1, includes a base having a supported surface adapted to be positioned along a generally vertical surface, and an opposite outer surface; an elongate peg having a longitudinal axis and first and second longitudinally spaced ends, a portion of which peg adjacent its first end is mounted on the base in a use position with the axis of said peg projecting away from said supported surface, at least a major portion of which peg adjacent its second end projects from the outer surface of the base. Also, the peg described in Schlaeppli has an axially extending surface portions adapted to be positioned uppermost when the supported surface is positioned along a generally vertical surface. Additionally, like the embodiment of the hanger according to the present invention claimed in claim 2, the peg described in Schlaeppli has screw threads around the axis of the peg as is claimed in claim 3 defining sharp edges along its surface portion.

Unlike the hanger according to the present invention, however, the hanger described by Schlaeppli has a tapered end portion 1 like that of a wood screw that is adapted to be embedded in a rigid object such as a picture frame (6), after which the hanger is supported in a fixed position on the rigid object in which it is embedded so that a barb (4) on its base can be pressed into a wall (7) and will then support along the wall (7) the rigid object (6) in which the hanger is embedded. The hanger described by Schlaeppli is not suitable for supporting flexible objects such as sheets of paper which can not help maintain the barb (4) in engagement with the wall.

In contrast to the structure of Schlaeppli, the paper hanger according to the present invention as claimed in claim 1 is for supporting one or more sheets of paper, and the major portion of the peg on which the paper sheets are supported has a generally uniform cross sectional area along its length. Sharp edges along that major portion as claimed in claim 2 can be defined by machine screw threads rather than wood screw threads, as is claimed in claim 3.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Schlaeppli to use the peg described therein to support sheets of paper, nor to provide a peg for supporting the sheets of paper that projects generally at a right angle with respect to the supported surface on its base and has a major portion

Application No.: 10/658,654Case No.: 56127US008

with a diameter of less than about 0.17 inch (0.43 centimeter) and a generally uniform cross sectional area along its length.

Nor is there any teaching or suggestion in Bussi to modify the structures of Schlaeppli and thereby make obvious the present invention as claimed in claim 1. Bussi describes a "locator element" having a threaded end portion adapted to engage a structure, and a larger protruding pointed portion projecting from that threaded end portion that will pierce a construction panel pressed against it and then indicate along the construction panel the location of the structure with which its treaded end portion is engaged.

With reference to combining the descriptions of Schlaeppli and Bussi the Examiner has suggested "It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have modified the hanger" of Schlaeppli "by substituting the fastener/peg (3) of Bussi for the peg because one would have been motivated to provide a means for self-tapping into objects formed of metal as taught by Bussi." We are uncertain of what part of Bussi's structure the Examiner would substitute for what part of Schlaeppli's structure, or how self tapping into metal objects relates to forming paper hangers. The structures described by Schlaeppli and Bussi are for totally different purposes, neither is a paper hanger, and we find no teaching or suggestion in Bussi to modify the structure of Schlaeppli to provide a paper hanger having the structure claimed in claim 1.

Claim 1 should be allowed.

Claims 2-4, 6, and 8-10 are dependent on claim 1, and thus are allowable for all of the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Additionally, these dependent claims include further structural limitations that are not shown or suggested in the claimed combination by Schlaeppli or Bussi. For example, claim 3 recites that the peg has machine screw threads to form peaks having sharp edges on its axially extending surface portion that restrict free movement of sheets of paper around peg axially of the peg. Claim 4 recites that the peg is serrated (see Fig. 6) to form peaks having sharp edges on its axially extending surface portion that restrict free movement of sheets of paper around peg axially of the peg. Claim 6 recites that the peg has axially spaced transverse ridges only on its axially extending surface portion to provide sharp edges adapted to restrict free movement of sheets of paper around peg axially of the peg.

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

**Rejection of independent claim 1, and claims 2-4, 6, 8-10 and 12 dependent on claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,040,149 to Einhorn in view of Bussi.**

Einhorn describes a hangers that, like the hanger according to the present invention as claimed in claim 1, includes a base having a supported surface adapted to be positioned along a generally vertical surface, and an opposite outer surface; an elongate peg having a longitudinal axis and first and second longitudinally spaced ends, a portion of which peg adjacent its first end is mounted on the base in a use position with the axis of said peg projecting away from said supported surface, at least a major portion of which peg adjacent its second end projects from the outer surface of the base. Also, the pegs described in these references have axially extending surface portions adapted to be positioned uppermost when the supported surface is positioned along a generally vertical surface.

Additionally, unlike the hanger according to the present invention, the peg (67) on the hanger described by Einhorn with reference to Figure 17 has a smooth tapered periphery, projects upwardly (see column 8, lines 36-39 of Einhorn) with respect to the support surface (66) on its base (69) in order to retain an object about it, and is adapted to be embedded in a rigid object such as a picture frame (70) (see Figures 19 and 20 and column 8, lines 43-55 of Einhorn), after which the hanger is supported in a fixed position on the rigid object in which it is embedded so that a barb (68) on its base can be pressed into a wall and will then support the frame (70) along the wall in which the barb (68) is embedded.

In contrast, the paper hanger according to the present invention as claimed in claim 1 is for supporting one or more sheets of paper, and the major portion of the peg on which the paper sheets are supported has a generally uniform cross sectional area along its length, projects generally at a right angle with respect to the supported surface on its base, and only an axially extending surface portion of the peg restricts free movement of sheets of paper around the peg axially of the peg.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Einhorn to use the pegs described therein to support sheets of paper, nor to provide a peg for supporting the sheets of paper that projects generally at a right angle with respect to the supported surface on its base and has a major portion with a

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

diameter of less than about 0.17 inch (0.43 centimeter) and a generally uniform cross sectional area along its length. There is no teaching or suggestion in Einhorn that these features were recognized as result effective variables. For this reason, no basis exists for the Examiner's conclusion that it would have been obvious to adapt these features based on "discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable". The Examiner's obviousness conclusion lacks the requisite suggestion for the proposed modifications as well as the requisite reasonable expectation that the proposed modifications would be successful. See In re O'Farrell, 853 F.2<sup>nd</sup> 846, 850-51, 7 USPQ2<sup>nd</sup> 1673, 1680-81 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Thus, the structure for a paper hanger recited in claim 1 is not made obvious by Einhorn.

Nor is there any teaching or suggestion in Bussi to modify the structure of Einhorn and thereby make obvious the present invention as claimed in claim 1. Bussi describes a "locator element" having a threaded end portion adapted to engage a structure, and a larger protruding pointed portion projecting from that threaded end portion that will pierce a construction panel pressed against it and then indicate along the construction panel the location of the structure with which its treaded end portion is engaged.

With reference to combining the descriptions of Einhorn and Bussi the Examiner has suggested "Bussi discloses a member (Fig.3) comprising a fastener (3) including a machine screw threaded portion (at 3) having a uniform cross-section area along its length. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have modified the hanger of Einhorn by substituting the fastener/peg (3) of Bussi for the peg (67) because one would have been motivated to provide a means for self-tapping into objects formed of metal as taught by Bussi (col. 4, lines 50-55)." We are again uncertain of how self tapping into metal objects relates to forming paper hangers. The structures described by Einhorn and Bussi are for totally different purposes, neither is suitable for a paper hanger, and we find no teaching or suggestion in Bussi to modify the structure of Einhorn to provide a paper hanger having the structure claimed in claim 1. It is only the applicant's own disclosure that provides any teaching or suggestion for the combination of structural features recited in claim 1. The Examiner's obviousness conclusion is based upon impermissible hindsight rather than upon some teaching suggestion or incentive derived from the applied prior art.

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

Claim 1 should be allowed.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8-10 and 12 are dependent on claim 1, and thus are allowable for all of the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Additionally, these dependent claims include further structural limitations that are not shown or suggested in the claimed combination by Einhorn or Bussi. For example, claim 4 recites that the peg is serrated (see Fig. 6) to form peaks having sharp edges on its axially extending surface portion that restrict free movement of sheets of paper around peg axially of the peg; whereas claim 6 recites that the peg has axially spaced transverse ridges only on its axially extending surface portion to provide sharp edges adapted to restrict free movement of sheets of paper around peg axially of the peg. Also, claim 12 recites that the portion of the peg adjacent its first end is mounted on the base for movement of the peg between its use position and a storage position with the peg extending along the outer surface of said base. While the hanger of Figure 34 in Einhorn has a hook (143) movable between two positions with respect to a base (140), there is not the faintest suggestion in Bussi that a peg of the type claimed in claim 12 should be substituted for that hook, since the structures described by Einhorn and Bussi are for totally different purposes, and neither is suggested for use as a paper hanger.

**Rejection of Claim 5 dependent on claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Sekikawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,866,583 to Batts and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,690,561 to Rowland et al.**

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 (which recites that the peg includes a coating of abrasive granules) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekikawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,866,583 to Batts and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,690,561 to Rowland et al. (Rowland). As noted above, Sekikawa does not teach or even suggest a paper hanger for supporting one or more sheets of paper. Also, Sekikawa does not suggest such a paper hanger in which an axially extending surface portion on the peg is coated with abrasive granules to restrict free movement of sheets of paper around the peg axially of the peg because of sharp edges provided by the abrasive granules. Batts describes granules of a soft resilient material such as rubber (see col. 2, lns 31-36) on various types of clothes hangers to restrict slippage of clothes

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

from around the hanger. Batts indicate that abrasive particles would not be useful for his purposes (see col. 5, lns 64-66). Rowland describes the use of sharp edges provided by serrations or abrasive granules on the face of a golf club to affect movement of a golf ball struck by the club. Sekikawa, Batts and Rowland describe structures from unrelated fields of art, none of which have anything to do with hangers for sheets of paper, and there is no teaching or suggestion in any of those references that would make obvious a paper hanger having the features for a paper hanger claimed in claim 5.

**Rejection of Claim 7 dependent on claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Sekikawa in view of Batts.**

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekikawa in view of Batts suggesting that Batts describes "an adhesive coating of abrasive granules (22)". As noted above, Batts describes granules of a soft resilient material such as rubber (see col. 2, lns 31-36). Claim 7, recites that the peg includes a coating of adhesive (not granules held in place by adhesive) defining the axially extending surface portion of the peg that restricts free movement of sheets of paper around the peg axially of the peg. There is no teaching or suggestion of such use of a coating of adhesive in Batts.

**Rejection of claim 11 dependent on claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Sekikawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,106,937 to Hamerski, and also as purportedly unpatentable over Schlaeppi in view of Bussi and further in view of Hamerski.**

Claim 11 is dependent on claim 1, and thus are allowable for all of the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

**Rejection of independent claim 13 and claims 15, and 17 to 20 dependent on claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,430,301 to Venus in view of Sekikawa.**

Independent claim 13 recites the combination of at least one sheet of paper with a through opening, and a hanger for the sheet of paper, which hanger comprises a major portion of a peg projecting from a base that has a diameter of less than about 0.17 inch (0.43 centimeter), a generally uniform cross sectional area along its length, and an axially extending surface portion defining closely spaced sharp edges, which portion of the peg extends through the opening in the sheet of paper, the surface portion defining the sharp edges being adapted to be positioned uppermost when the supported surface is positioned along a generally vertical surface so that only the sharp edges restrict movement of the sheet of paper around said peg axially of the peg. The Examiner has rejected claim 13 (together with claims 15 and 17-20 dependent on claim 13) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,430,301 to Venus in view of Sekikawa.

Venus is the only references cited by the Examiner against the claims in this application that describes a hanger for sheets of paper. The structure of the hanger described by Venus, however, is significantly different than the structure of the paper hanger claimed in claim 13. As noted by the Examiner, Venus does not describe a peg that is mounted at a right angle with respect to a supported surface or a surface portion defining closely spaced sharp edges. There is no teaching or suggestion in Sekikawa to modify the structures described by Venus to provide those structures. As stated above, the clothes hanger described by Sekikawa has nothing to do with hanging sheets of paper, and does not describe or suggest a peg having a diameter of less than about 0.17 inch (0.43 centimeter). Thus, claim 13 should be allowed together with claims 15 and 17-20 dependent on claim 13.



Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

**Rejection of claim 14 dependent on claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Venus in view of Sekikawa in view of Schlaeppli and further in view of Bussi.**

Claims 14 is dependent on claim 13 and is thus allowable for all of the reasons given above with respect to claim 13. Additionally, claim 14 recites further structural limitations that are not shown or suggested by the cited art. Specifically, claim 14 recites that the sharp edges of the surface portion are defined by machine screw threads. The Examiner has added Schlaeppli to the combination of Venus and Sekikawa in rejecting claim 14. As noted above, however, the structure described by Schlaeppli has nothing to do with a hanger for sheets of paper, provides no teaching or suggestion to modify the structures of Venus or Sekikawa, and thus would not make obvious the threads claimed in claim 14. In any event, the threads described in Schlaeppli are tapered woodscrew threads, whereas claim 14 recites machine screw threads which are not tapered. Thus claim 14 should be allowed.

**Rejection of claim 16 dependent on claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Venus in view of Sekikawa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,690,561 to Rowland et al.**

Claim 16 is dependent on claim 13 and is thus allowable for all of the reasons given above with respect to claim 13. Additionally, claim 16 recites further structural limitations that are not shown or suggested by the cited art. Specifically, claim 16 recites that the peg includes a coating of abrasive granules that provide the sharp edges of the surface portion. The Examiner has added Rowland et al to the combination of Venus and Sekikawa in rejecting claim 16. As stated above with respect to claim 5, Rowland describes the use of sharp edges provided by abrasive granules on the face of a golf club to affect movement of a golf ball struck by the club. Rowland describes structures from an unrelated field of art (i.e., golf clubs), which has nothing to do with hangers for sheets of paper, and there is no teaching or suggestion in Rowland et al to use abrasive granules to form sharp edges on the claimed surface portion of a paper hanger. Thus claims 16 should be allowed.

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner has erred in rejecting this application. Please reverse the Examiner on all counts.

Respectfully submitted,

August 4, 2005  
Date

By: W<sup>2</sup> L. Huebsch  
William L. Huebsch, Reg. No.: 25,990  
Telephone No.: (651) 733-2835

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

**CLAIMS APPENDIX**

1. A paper hanger for supporting one or more sheets of paper, said paper hanger comprising:
  - a base having a supported surface adapted to be positioned along a generally vertical surface, and an opposite outer surface;
  - an elongate peg having a longitudinal axis and first and second longitudinally spaced ends, a portion of said peg adjacent said first end being mounted on said base in a use position with the axis of said peg being generally at a right angle with respect to said supported surface, and a major portion of said peg adjacent said second end projecting from said outer surface, said major portion of said peg having a diameter of less than about 0.17 inch ( 0.43 centimeter), having a generally uniform cross sectional area along its length, and having an axially extending surface portion adapted to be positioned uppermost when said supported surface is positioned along a generally vertical surface, only said axially extending surface portion of said peg being adapted to restrict free movement of sheets of paper around said peg axially of said peg.
2. A paper hanger according to claim 1 wherein said axially extending surface portion of said peg defines closely spaced sharp edges that are adapted to restrict free movement of sheets of paper around said peg axially of said peg.
3. A paper hanger according to claim 2 wherein said sharp edges are defined by machine screw threads extending around the axis of said peg.
4. A paper hanger according to claim 2 wherein said peg is serrated to form peaks having said sharp edges.
5. A paper hanger according to claim 2 wherein said peg includes a coating of abrasive granules that have said sharp edges.

Application No.: 10/658,654Case No.: 56127US008

6. A paper hanger according to claim 2 wherein said peg has axially spaced transverse ridges only on said axially extending surface portion that have said sharp edges.
7. A paper hanger according to claim 1 wherein said peg includes a coating of adhesive defining said axially extending surface portion of said peg that is adapted to restrict free movement of sheets of paper around said peg axially of said peg.
8. A paper hanger according to claim 1 wherein said second end of said peg is pointed.
9. A paper hanger according to claim 1 wherein said major portion of said peg adjacent said second end projects from said outer surface of said base by a distance in a range of about 0.15 to 0.30 inch ( 0.38 to 0.76 centimeter).
10. A paper hanger according to claim 1 wherein said peg has a diameter of about 0.11 inch (0.28 centimeter) and said major portion of said peg adjacent said second end projects from said outer surface of said base by a distance in a range of about 0.15 to 0.30 inch ( 0.38 to 0.76 centimeter).
11. A paper hanger according to claim 1 further including a length of stretch release adhesive adhered to the supported surface of said base and adapted for adhering said base to a generally vertical surface.
12. A paper hanger according to claim 1 wherein said portion of said peg adjacent said first end is mounted on said base for movement of said peg between said use position and a storage position with said peg extending along the outer surface of said base.

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

13. A combination including  
at least one sheet of paper, said sheet of paper having a through opening; and  
a hanger for the sheet of paper, said hanger comprising:  
a base having a supported surface adapted to be positioned along a generally  
vertical surface, and an opposite outer surface; and  
an elongate peg having a longitudinal axis and first and second longitudinally  
spaced ends, a portion of said peg adjacent said first end being mounted on said base with  
the axis of said peg being generally at a right angle with respect to said supported surface,  
and a major portion of said peg adjacent said second end projecting from said outer surface,  
said major portion of said peg having a diameter of less than about 0.17 inch (0.43  
centimeter), having a generally uniform cross sectional area along its length, and having an  
axially extending surface portion defining closely spaced sharp edges, said portion of said  
peg adjacent said second end extending through said opening in said sheet of paper, and  
said surface portion defining said sharp edges being adapted to be positioned uppermost  
when said supported surface is positioned along a generally vertical surface so that only said  
sharp edges restrict movement of said sheet of paper around said peg axially of said peg.
14. A combination according to claim 13 wherein said sharp edges are defined by machine  
screw threads extending around the axis of said peg.
15. A combination according to claim 13 wherein said peg is serrated to form peaks having  
said sharp edges.
16. A combination according to claim 13 wherein said peg includes a coating of abrasive  
granules that have said sharp edges.
17. A combination according to claim 13 wherein said second end of said peg is pointed.

Application No.: 10/658,654Case No.: 56127US008

18. A paper hanger according to claim 13 wherein said peg has axially spaced transverse ridges only on said axially extending surface portion that have said sharp edges.

19. A paper hanger according to claim 13 wherein said major portion of said peg adjacent said second end projects from said outer surface of said base by a distance in a range of about 0.15 to 0.30 inch ( 0.38 to 0.76 centimeter).

20. A paper hanger according to claim 13 wherein said peg has a diameter of about 0.11 inch (0.28 centimeter) and said major portion of said peg adjacent said second end projects from said outer surface of said base by a distance in a range of about 0.15 to 0.30 inch ( 0.38 to 0.76 centimeter).

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

**EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

None.

Application No.: 10/658,654

Case No.: 56127US008

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

None.